



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES.

ANTE AND POST.

It has long been known that *ante* and *post* are ablatives, as in *antidea postidea*, but to what stems they belong and what is their relation to each other is not so clear. Their form, as well as that of their derivatives *antīcus* and *postīcus* (cf. Sk. *antikam*), points to *i*-stems, of which the nominatives would be the *-ti* stems respectively *antīs* and *postīs*. With *ante* belong Sk. *antī*, Gr. *ἀντί*, and Goth. *and-*, doubtless from the same stem, but of uncertain case. Of the same root (cf. Sk. *ani*, *ἐν*, *εἰς*, *in*, *ἐν-τερον*, *inter*, etc.), but with a *-to*, *-tā* suffix, are Sk. *anta* (*end*), Goth. *andis* (*end*), Gr. *ἀντην* (acc.), *ἄντα* (of uncertain case). In Latin we have of the *-ti* stem *antes*, used of rows of plants, and perhaps rows of men. If this word is regarded as meaning *files*, *i.e.* rows looked at 'end on,' the whole group of *t*-formations is a natural one, although its connection with the simple root in *ἐν*, etc., is still obscure. *Ante* would naturally mean something like 'on the front end.' With this fits very well the meaning of *antae* used in the expression *templum in antis* (*ἐν παρὰ-στάσι*), of a temple built within two side-walls, which project more or less beyond the temple itself, leaving a portico covered by the gable end of the roof. In this case the projecting side-walls are the rows or files standing 'end on' to the spectator (see Vitruvius III. 1, IV. 4 and 7; Gruter, 207).


The stem of *post* is evidently a *-ti* stem of the same kind as that of *ante*, from the root (or stem) *pas*, appearing in *po(s)ne*, Sk. *paçcha* (*pas* + *go*), *paçchā* (instr. adv., *behind*), *paçchāt* (abl. adv., *from behind, after*), and in Gr. *πύμαρος*, *πυνός*. Thus the two adverbs, *on the front* and *on the back*, seem to fit in with their kindred.

The only objection to the latter combination is found in the Latin *postis*, which is in form the precise word of which *post* (*postid*) should be the ablative, as *antes* represents the stem from which *ante*

should come. Now *postis* gives no signs of having had any meaning in Latin except that of *doorpost*, and hence sometimes *door*. It is as if *postern* should become the regular word for *door* in English. How 'the front door' should come to be 'on the back side,' it seems difficult to explain.

It occurred to my colleague, Professor F. D. Allen, and myself, that the explanation of the anomaly was to be found in the Roman augural discipline or ritual, a system which must have had an enormous influence on the Latin language and customs. The words *anticus* and *posticus* seem to have a special relation to that system. Nor does the expression *templum in antis* seem a natural one except in connection with some special method of construction having a peculiar significance. Now if we consider that the first Roman temples were built under Etruscan influence, and that in the whole early history augury was supposed to have played a prominent part, it is natural to refer this peculiar expression, and in fact the whole system of temple construction, to the augural discipline.

In Festus (M.), 157, we find *minora templa fiunt ab auguribus cum loca aliqua tabulis aut linteis sepiuntur ne uno amplius ostio pateant certis verbis definita. itaque templum est locus ita effatus aut ita sepius ut ea una parte pateat † angulus quod adfixus habeat ad terram* (cf. Cic. de Div. II. 35 ; Liv. IV. 7 ; Plut. Marc. 5 ; Serv. Aen. II. 178 ; Interpres ad Serv. Aen. IV. 200 ; Varr. de L. L. VII. 8). The last part of the Festus passage is corrupt and unintelligible, but a slight change to *angulos qua adfixos habeat ad terram* makes very good sense. This reading would still leave it in doubt whether the rear or the front *anguli* were referred to.

In the passage Interp. ad Serv. Aen. IV. 200, the phrase *uno exitu* occurs, and this method of structure seems to be emphasized here as in Festus. Nothing is said about a roof. We are thus left in doubt whether the construction was that of a bark shanty, enclosed with two side-walls and a back, with the front open to the south, or that of a sheepfold with a single door at the north, conceived as the back. The so-called *auguratorium* on the Palatine points to the former, and seems to be the original of the *templum in antis*. The form of the *auguratorium* is this:  The words of Festus, however, seem to point to the second form of construction.

The reading *angulos*, etc., would fit either view, but better still a

construction with a front open, and a back-door besides. In that case the front must be regarded as religiously enclosed, so that there is no entrance or exit in that quarter.

But on any supposition, in the laying out of a *templum* for the great sacred edifices, the *cella* or main temple could not be in front of the augur, but, as the Palatine *auguratorium* shows, at the back. It would thus correspond to the *templum in antis*, wherein the back part of the *locus effatus* is cut off for a *cella*, and has its door or *postes* at the back of the augur, where, according to the etymology of the word, they ought to be. So if we conceive the original locating of a temple *augurando*, we may well suppose the augur to have taken his observations from a spot in front of the proposed structure, with his field marked out at the sides. In front of him would be the *pars antica*, and behind the *pars postica*. Whether there was originally at the back of this field a door (the *unum ostium* of Festus, the *unus exitus* of the Commentator), or whether the augur himself then for the first time marked the place for the front of the temple, in either case *postis* would be the natural name for the doorpost in the rear, which the official afterwards took hold of (*postem tenere*) in the act of dedication. If this view be taken, the whole list swings into line with *ante* and *post* in the most natural manner, and the only obstacle to the combination is removed.

J. B. GREENOUGH.

PETRONIANA.

1. Petron. c. 21 Buech. *uterque nostrum religiosissimis iuravit verbis, inter duos perituum esse tam horribile secretum*. These words should perhaps be removed from their present position and placed after *periculo nostro* in c. 18. The "*horribile secretum*" will then be equivalent to the *tot annorum secreta* of c. 17 *ad fin.*, and the continuity of c. 21 will be increased by the change.

2. *Ibid.* c. 58: *qui te primus deurode fecit*. The word *deurode* is manifestly corrupt. Buecheler says in his third edition (p. 38, note): "*latere puto graecum tale eleutherode*." Perhaps we should read *lerode*, i.e. ληρώδη, "*nugatorem*," which gives very good sense. The corruption was possibly due to confusion between Λ and Δ.

3. *Ibid.* c. 58: *mufrius, non magister*. The word *mufrius* is yet unexplained, and is probably corrupt. Can it be an error for *musrius*, a corruption of *μυσσάρως*?

4. *Ibid.* c. 60: *et repente nova ludorum missio hilaritatem hic refecit*. It is clear from the context, as Buecheler and others long ago pointed out, that *refecit* gives exactly the opposite sense from that which Petronius intended to convey. Ought we not rather to read *resecuit*, "checked," "cut short"? Cf. Hor. Od. I. 11, 6: *et spatio brevi spem longam reseces*; Plin. Epist. II. 5. 4.

5. *Ibid.* c. 62: *gladium tamen strinxi et matavita tau umbras cecidi*. A "locus desperatissimus." The conjecture which comes nearest to the reading of the Ms. is that of Antonius, *mota vi tota*. Scheffer's *in tota via*, which Buecheler has accepted, is well suited to the context, but differs too widely from the Ms. reading. One is strongly tempted to conjecture that, instead of *matavitata*, Petronius wrote *mataiotata*, or rather *ματαιότατα*, "in the most random fashion." This gives excellent sense, but is perhaps too recondite a word for a rustic like Niceros. One might also read *motu citato*, but this is less plausible.

6. *Ibid.* c. 63: *mehercules margaritum caccitus et omnium numerum*. *Caccitus* is clearly corrupt. Beck conjectured *ac scitus*; Jacobs, *catamitus*. Possibly we should read *cataclistus*, i.e. *κατάκλειστος*, a word applied to precious objects laid away for safe-keeping. *Cataclista vestis* occurs in Apul. Met. XI. 9.

7. *Ibid.* c. 71: *valde enim falsum est vivo quidem domos cultas esse, et seqq.* It seems almost certain that instead of *falsum*, which Buecheler retains, we should read with Heinsius *insulsum*, which is really a very slight change and suits the connection admirably.

8. *Ibid.* c. 87: *rogare coepi ephēbum ut reverteretur in gratiam mecum, id est ut pateretur satis fieri sibi*. The last clause is a manifest gloss, and should be bracketed. The phrase *reverti in gratiam* in this sense occurs again and again in Petronius without any such explanatory comment.

SOPH. TRACH. 145.

χόροισιν αὐτοῦ καὶ νῦν οὐ θάλασπος θεοῦ. This line is clearly corrupt, but no one of the many conjectures that have been made seems entirely satisfactory. The best is probably the old one of Arndt,

χώροις ἔν' αὐτ' οὐκ αἰθίνου θάλπος θεοῦ. Αἰθίνος is attested only by Hesychius and the Etym. Mag., and we have no authority for its occurrence in tragedy. If αἰθίνου is not accepted, perhaps we should read χώροις ἔν' αὐτ' ἀκμαῖον οὐ θάλπος θεοῦ. Ἀκμαῖον οὐ for καὶ νιν οὐ is not a very harsh change, and the expression ἀκμαῖον θάλπος, 'strong' or 'violent heat,' suits the context very well.

ARIST. Ἀθ. πολ. C. 4 (P. 7, L. 10, K. & W.)

καὶ παρέστηκεν ἵππος ἐκμαρτυρῶν, ὡς τὴν ἱππάδα τοῦτο σημαίνουσιν. Here ἐκμαρτυρῶν must be wrong. Perhaps we should read καὶ παρέστηκεν ἵππος, ὡς τεκμαίρονται, τὴν ἱππάδα αὐτοῦ σημαίνουσα, i.e. "and by it stands (a statue of) a mare, indicating, as they infer, his (i.e. Anthemion's) rank of knight." One might also think of ἐκ μαρμαῖον as a possible reading for ἐκμαρτυρῶν.

LIV. 22. 17. 2.

Et metus ipse relucens flammæ a capite, etc. So Madvig. The Cod. Puteanus has by the first hand *excapite a capite*, while the second hand gives *ex capite a capite*, which seems to point to a dittography. But is it not possible that *excapite* of P¹ is a corruption of *extemplo*? If we read *relucens flammæ extemplo a capite calorque iam ad vivum ad imaque cornua veniens*, etc., we have a needed antithesis between the immediate blazing of the fire and the gradual burning down to the roots of the horns.

H. W. HALEY.

LIVY, I. 55. 1.

Inde ad negotia urbana animum conuertit; quorum erat primum, ut Iouis templum in monte Tarpeio monumentum regni sui nominisque relinqueret: *Tarquinius reges ambos, patrem uouisse, filium perfecisse.*

This passage seems to imply either that an inscription was actually attached to this temple, or that it was the intention of Tarquin to attach one to it, for how could the building possibly be a memorial of all that is here stated without an inscription?

The words in italics, if changed to direct discourse, would make an excellent inscription, and it is at least possible that they served or were intended to serve this purpose.

Although the temple of Jupiter was not completed and dedicated until the first year of the republic, there is every indication that the work was nearly completed at the time when the Tarquins were expelled. May not the work have advanced so far that the inscription was actually placed on the temple?

If afterwards the Roman hatred of kings led them to object to this public mention of them, and if the inscription was then replaced by a new one, some tradition of the existence of the original inscription may have remained; in fact, the very words of the original may have been quoted by some writer from whose book Livy drew his account of the story.

There are many inscriptions of exactly this character, *e.g.* the original inscription on the Pantheon, Wilmanns, 731 :

M · Agrippa · L · F · Cos · Tertium · Fecit.

The inscription C.I.L., I. 591, which originally belonged in the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus as restored by Quintus Catulus, contains no mention of the temple nor of the deities to whom it was dedicated; it simply states that Catulus *de sen. sent. faciundum coeravit eidemque probavit*.

The plural form Tarquinii and the omission of the prænomena is paralleled by Wilmanns, 92 : Antonii Mariani Pater et Filius.

A. A. HOWARD.

ON THE MEANINGS OF CERTAIN GREEK VERBS.

In Hom. *α* 127 ff. we read : —

ἔγχος μὲν ῥ' ἔστηκε φέρων πρὸς κίονα μακρὴν
 δουροδόκης ἐντοσθεν ἐϋξόου, ἐνθα περ ἄλλα
 ἔγχ' Ὀδυσσεύς ταλασίφρονος ἵστατο πολλά,
 αὐτὴν δ' ἐς θρόνον εἶσεν ἄγων, κ.τ.λ.

What is the meaning here of *ἵστατο*? Usually *ἵσταμαι* must or may be translated 'to take a stand,' 'to arise,' or the like. That is to say, the present regularly expresses a movement, and is thus sharply

contrasted with the quiescent perfect ἔστηκα, 'to stand.' But in the passage quoted it seems inevitable to take ἵστατο as equivalent to ἐστήκει. Cf. Hom. N 261 f. : —

δούρατα δ', αἱ κ' ἐθέλησθα, καὶ ἐν καὶ εἴκοσι δῆεις
ἐσταότ' ἐν κλισίῃ.

This same use of ἵσταμαι appears pretty clearly in Homer in K 173, Ψ 517, τ 201, not to insist on numerous other places where the translation 'to stand' is tempting, but the more regular meaning may be saved by a little determination; e.g. II 166, 305, X 318.

In post-Homeric Greek of the classical period it is not easy to find unquestionable cases of the same usage. Thuc. II. 97, 1, ἣν αἰεὶ κατὰ πρύμναν ἱστῆται τὸ πνεῦμα, looks that way, especially when compared with Thuc. VI. 104, 2 : (ἄνεμος) κατὰ βορέαν ἑστηκώς. Nevertheless, an objector might maintain that in the former passage there is a notion of 'rising.' At any rate, in Xen. Anab. I. 10, 1, οὐκέτι ἵστανται, ἀλλὰ φεύγουσι, it is clear that ἵστανται means 'hold their ground.' In post-classical Greek analogous usages become commoner, and in the modern literary language ἵσταμαι is regular for 'to stand.'

The case of ἵσταμαι is not a solitary case. On the contrary, there is a considerable series of verbs which show in the present and future systems similar double meanings. In these verbs the aorist signifies 'to put into such and such a condition'; the present, either 'to put' or 'to keep.' The phenomenon is not, of course, confined to the middle voice; voice has, fundamentally, nothing to do with the matter. But in several cases I have not noted crucial illustrations of the double meaning in each voice, while in κρεμάννυμι and the collateral κρήμνυμι the two voices seem to have really differentiated, one appropriating one meaning and the other the other. Following is a list, doubtless incomplete, of the verbs in question. The citations are merely exemplary, but are meant to be decisive. Naturally, in great numbers of cases the two senses cannot be confidently discriminated.

εἰνάζω, 'to put to bed' (Soph. O. T. 961); εἰνάζομαι, 'to go to bed,' 'lie down' (Hom. δ 449 and often); also, 'to lie in bed' (Eur.

Or. 151); cf. εἰνᾶσθαι (Soph. O. C. 1569).

κοιμάω, 'to put to bed,' 'put to sleep' (Aesch. Ag. 580); κοιμῶμαι,

- ‘to lie down’ (Xen. Cyr. VIII. 8, 9) ; also, ‘to lie,’ ‘to sleep’ (Aesch. Ag. 2, Xen. Hier. 6, 7).
- κρεμάννυμι, κρήμνημι, ‘to hang,’ ‘*suspendo*’ (Aristot. H. A. 612^a 10, Pind. Pyth. 4, 43) ; κρέμαμαι, κρήνναμαι, ‘to hang,’ ‘*pendeo*’ (Plat. Legg. 831 C, Aristoph. Nub. 377, and often).
- κρύπτω, ‘to put in hiding,’ ‘cover up’ (Herod. V. 4, Eur. Hipp. 245, 250) ; also, ‘to keep in hiding,’ ‘keep concealed’ (Hom. Hymn. Cer. 240, Soph. El. 957) ; also, ‘to remain in hiding’ (Soph. El. 826) ; κρύπτομαι, ‘to be in hiding,’ much like κέκρυμμαι (Eur. Or. 1107).
- λείπω, ‘to go away from’ (Hom. X 226, κ 462 and often) ; also, ‘to leave remaining’ (Hom. Ω 726) ; λείπομαι, often, ‘to remain,’ like λέλειμμαι (Herod. IX. 45, Thuc. VIII. 81, 3) ; especially in the impersonal λείπεται (e.g. Plat. Theaet. 157 E, Aristot. Eth. Nic. 1106^a 9). Cf. μοιούμενος, apparently synonymous with μεμονωμένος (Eur. Alc. 380, Plat. Legg. 710 B).
- ὁμοιόω, ‘to make like’ (Thuc. III. 82, 2) ; ὁμοιοῦμαι, ‘to become like’ (Plat. Theaet. 176 E, Aristot. Eth. Nic. 1172^a 10) ; also ‘to be like’ (Thuc. II. 97, 6, Eur. Bacch. 1348?).
- ὀρθόω, ‘to set upright’ (Archil. 53 [33], Eur. Tro. 505, Aristot. Pol. 1322^b 20) ; also, ‘to hold upright’ (Eur. Hec. 60, Bacch. 364, Plat. Lach. 181 A, B, Legg. 957 D) ; ὀρθοῦμαι, ‘to rise’ (Aesch. Eum. 698) ; also, ‘to be held upright’ (Soph. Aj. 161), or, ‘to keep oneself upright’ (Soph. El. 742, Xen. Cyr. I. 3, 10, VIII. 8, 10, Symp. 2, 25) ; often figuratively (e.g. Herod. VII. 103).
- ἀποστερῶ, ‘to take away from the owner,’ ‘to rob’ (Aristoph. Av. 1605, Plat. Legg. 873 A, C) ; also, ‘to keep from the owner,’ ‘to withhold’ (Soph. O. T. 323, Xen. Mem. I. 7, 5, Anab. VII. 6, 9) ; στεροῦμαι, ἀποστεροῦμαι, ‘to have one’s property seized’ (Plat. Theaet. 201 B) ; also, ‘to be kept in deprivation,’ like ἀπεστέρημαι (Eur. Hipp. 1460, Thuc. III. 39, 8, Isocr. VII. 25). See Veitch, Greek Verbs, s.v. στερέω. Wilamowitz (Herakles II. 78–9), from whom two of the foregoing citations have been borrowed, is too absolute, when he says : “στερεῖσθαι ist nicht *privari* sondern *carere*. . . auch das activ ἀποστερεῖν bedeutet nicht ‘berauben’ sondern ‘vorenthalten.’”

CIC. IN CAT. IV. 3, 6.

Latius opinione disseminatum est hoc malum : manavit non solum per Italiam, verum etiam transcendit Alpes, et obscure serpens multas iam provincias occupavit.

It is often said that in English most common metaphors are dead, *i.e.* have lost their original metaphorical picturesqueness, whereas in Latin the understanding of the metaphor survived. That this last is not by any means a universal truth is evident from the passage cited. The *malum* is, of course, the conspiracy of Catiline and the causes leading to it. This is said to be *disseminatum*, *i.e.* it is compared to *seed* sown broadcast ; then it *manavit*, *i.e.* it is compared to a *liquid* ; then *transcendit Alpis*, *i.e.* it is compared to some living creature or creatures, perhaps with a faint reminiscence of Hannibal ; then *obscure serpens*, where some creeping reptile is brought before the mind, *provincias occupavit*. In the last words Cicero seems to leave metaphor and revert to a plain statement that the prevailing discontent has taken possession of many provinces, though even here the expression suggests allusion to a *hostile army*.

It is hardly possible that Cicero consciously mixed his metaphors to such an extent. If his hearers retained in their minds the fundamental meaning of each word, the effect of this whole sentence would have been as absurd as that of the famous "I smell a rat ; I see him floating in the air ; but I will nip him in the bud."

PLUTARCH, QU. GR., § I.

Τίνες ἐν Ἐπιδαύρῳ κονίποδες καὶ ἄρτυνοι ; οἱ μὲν τὸ πολίτευμα ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἄνδρες ἦσαν. ἐκ δὲ τούτων ἡρῶντο βουλευτὰς, οὓς ἀρτύλους ἐκάλουν, κτέ.

According to this, the whole number of active citizens at Epidaurus was 180, and from this number were chosen senators called *ἄρτυνοι*. It is hard to believe that the oligarchy was so exclusive, and certainly if the number of citizens was so small, it would have been unnecessary to choose a senate, as the whole body could easily have met for deliberation. The 180 must have been the senate, and the *ἄρτυνοι* must have had some other functions. This is substantially the opinion of Tittmann (Darstellung d. gr. Staatsverfassungen,

p. 359) and C. O. Müller (Aeginetica, p. 134, and Dorier, II. p. 140).

I think a word has fallen out, and the passage should read : οἱ μὲν τὸ πολίτευμα [διοικούντες?] ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν ἄνδρες ἦσαν, ἐκ δὲ τούτων ἡρῶντο τῶν βουλευτῶν, οὓς ἄρτύνους ἐκάλουν. When once the word διοικούντες (or another word of similar meaning) had fallen out, the genitive τῶν βουλευτῶν had no sense and was naturally changed to βουλευτάς. The statement, "those who governed the state were 180 men, and from these senators they chose the so-called ἄρτυνοι," is at least reasonable.

Gilbert (Gr. Staatsalt. II. p. 86, 315) accepts the statement of Plutarch as it stands in the texts, but makes the ἄρτυνοι equivalent to the πρόβουλοι of Corinth and other states. The 180 he regards as representatives of the Doric families. He does not, however, explain how the ἄρτυνοι came to be called βουλευταί, their functions being those of πρόβουλοι, nor how the 180 representatives came to be called τὸ πολίτευμα.

Hesychius (*s.v.*) defines ἄρτυνος by ἄρχων, and Thucydides (V. 47) gives an official document, in which the ἀρτῦναι at Argos are mentioned, corresponding, at least so far as position in the sentence is concerned, to the ἐνδημοὶ ἀρχαί at Athens. In view of Plutarch's expression concerning the ἄρτυνοι at Epidaurus, it seems improbable that ἀρτῦναι should be a general term, — a local Argive expression equivalent to ἀρχαί. It refers rather to a body of officers distinct from the senate and the board of eighty mentioned by Thucydides. This agrees also with the general meaning of ἀρτύνω and its derivatives, for which see the lexicon.

The number of citizens at Epidaurus is, then, unknown, the senate numbered 180, and from the senate the magistrates called ἄρτυνοι were chosen. The powers of the ἄρτυνοι may have been similar to those of the πρόβουλοι elsewhere, or may have been greater, like those of the Spartan ephors or Cretan kosmoi.

In the passage of Thucydides mentioned above, most editors read οἱ ἀρτῦναι for Ms. αἱ ἀρτῦναι. The only authority for a form (ὁ) ἀρτύνης (ἀρτύνας) is Herodian I. p. 56, and II. p. 653, ed. Lentz. In both these places the form Ἀρτύνας occurs among proper names, and Lentz is probably right in taking this word also as a proper name. Of course, as Stahl (on Thuc. V. 47) suggests, it is possible

that there may have been two forms, ἄρτυνος and ἀρτύνας. His other suggestion, that ἄρτυνος in Plut. and Hesych. is corrupt, would deserve more consideration if the Ms. reading in Thuc. were οἱ ἀρτύναι. The Ms. reading αἱ ἀρτύναι can be explained by assuming that the office stands for the officials.

HAROLD N. FOWLER.

LYSIAS, XVI. 10.

καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἅπαντας οὕτως βεβίωκα ὥστε μηδεπώποτε μοι πρὸς ἓνα μηδὲν ἔγκλημα γενέσθαι.

The phrase μοι . . . γενέσθαι is interpreted by the commentators in different ways. An explanation of it is also given by Liddell and Scott. The question is whether it means 'No person has ever had ground of complaint against me,' or 'I have never had ground of complaint against anybody.' This question can be settled only by a comparison of other passages in which a similar phrase occurs.

In SOPH. *Phil.* 323, ἔχεις | ἔγκλημ' Ἀτρεΐδαις, the dat. of the person is evidently used in the sense of *against*. In the following passages the same dat. occurs, and also πρὸς with the acc. of the offended party or the party that brings the ἔγκλημα: XEN. *Hellen.* vii. 4, 34, καταλιπεῖν εἰς τὸν αἰὶ χρόνον τοῖς παισὶν ἔγκλημα τοῦτο πρὸς τοὺς θεούς. HYP. *Lyc.* xiii. p. 31 (Blass), οὐτε αἰτίαν πονηρὰν οὐδεμίαν πώποτ' ἔλαβον, οὐτ' ἔγκλημά μοι πρὸς οὐδένα τῶν πολιτῶν γέγονε. LYS. X. 23, τίνος ὄντος ἐμοὶ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐγκλήματος; (the context fixing the meaning). In DEM. I. 7, ἐπεὶ δὲ δ' ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς ἐγκλημάτων μισοῦσι (Φίλιππον), there is no dat., but we have the same πρὸς and acc.: so in LYS. XXV. 23, ὥσπερ μηδενὸς ἐγκλήματος πρὸς ἀλλήλους γεγενημένου.

These passages show that the phrase in LYS. XVI. 10 should be rendered, '*there has never been any ground of complaint at all against me on the part of a single solitary man.*' They also explain XEN. *Cyr.* i. 2. 6, γίνεταί γὰρ δὴ καὶ παισὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ὥσπερ ἀνδράσιν ἐγκλήματα. This passage leads the editors of the *Lexicon* to say that '*I have a ground of complaint against somebody*' could be expressed by γίνεταί or ἔστι ἔγκλημά μοι πρὸς τινα. In support of this they quote LYS. X. 23 (see above), which, rendered as they

propose, could not possibly make sense with the context. Their imaginary sentence would rightly be expressed: γίγνεται δ' ἐγκλημά τινι πρὸς με. In all these sentences the use of πρὸς is very like that in Lys. XIII. 75; cf. XXIII. 13, ἀμφισβητῶν μὴ πρὸς τὸν πολέμαρχον εἶναί οἱ τὰς δίκας. But Shuckburgh goes too far in rendering XVI. 10 μῆδὲ πρὸς ἓνα, *before no one single magistrate*. Although Lutz (*die Präpositionen bei den attischen Redern*, p. 160) recognizes this local use of πρὸς, he wrongly states that with ἐγκλημα it has the sense of *against*; he cites no example to prove it (p. 163). For ἐγκλημα in the sense of *ground of complaint* (not the mere written bill of charges), see Meier & Schömann, *Att. Process.*, p. 195, Lips.

AESCHYLUS, AG. 412 SQ. (421 SQ. WECK.).

In this passage the codd. (*f* and *h*) read:—

πάρεστι σιγᾶς ἄτιμος ἀλοίδορος
ἄδιστος ἀφειμένων ἰδεῖν.

These words make no sense. Many emendations have been offered. The one most commonly accepted is that of Hermann, who reads:—

πάρεστι σιγᾶς ἀτίμους ἀλοιδόρους
αἰσχιστ' ἀφειμένων ἰδεῖν,

and thus interprets: 'Behold the silence, scorned yet unrebuking, of those so shamefully deserted.' It is generally admitted that something like this was what Aeschylus meant to say, but to get at it Hermann had to alter five words, as well as one in the antistrophe. I desire to offer an emendation which preserves the same general thought with a much slighter change of text.

In the Farnesian Ms. and the edition of Victorius we have a scholion on this passage. The writer attempted a paraphrase and made confusion of it, but in spite of his errors it seems incredible that he should have interpreted, as he did, the common word ἄτιμος by πολύτιμος. It is also striking that, in the Florentine Ms. (which has no scholia just here), the same word πολύτιμος is written as a gloss just over ἄτιμος. It is well known that some of these scholia and glosses are much more ancient than the codd. themselves, and here I believe that we are on the track of a reading older than the Medi-

cean. What word might call for the definition *πολύτιμος*? Maybe *ζάτιμος*. There is no such word in our dictionaries, but it is a good word enough in itself, and Aeschylus uses *ζαπληθής* and *ζάπυρος*. The copyist of the Medicean may have carried in his mind the sounds *σῖγα ζάτιμος*, and have written them as *σιγὰς ἄτιμος*. Restoring the former, we have, —

πάρεστι σῖγα ζάτιμος ἀλοῖδορος
ἄδιστος ἀφειμένων ἰδεῖν,

which I would interpret: ‘He is there in silence, full of honor, unrepublishing, sweetest of those who have ceased to behold (her).’ We should, however, expect the genitive with *ἀφείμαι* in this sense; hence it may be better to write with Hermann *ἀφειμένων*, interpreting ‘sweetest of deserted ones,’ and to take *ἰδεῖν* with *πάρεστι*, ‘he is to be seen’; cf. Eur. I. T. 291; Goodwin, M. T. 768.

The metrical scheme would be: —

υ : — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — Λ
> : — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — Λ

or, with *ἀφειμένων*: —

> : — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — Λ

The antistrophe, without a change, would be: —

τὸ πᾶν δ’ ἀφ’ Ἑλλάδος αἶας συννορμένους
πένθεια τλησικάρδιος.

υ : — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — Λ
> : — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — υ | — Λ

I see no musical reason for a change, and I do not believe in wholesale emendation to make strophe and antistrophe correspond exactly, syllable for syllable. That such emendation must be resorted to in order to obtain exactness of correspondence in the choruses of tragedy is made very evident in Dr. Verrall’s preface to his edition of the Agamemnon.

M. H. MORGAN.